DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 647 CS 202 737

AUTHOR Ruth, Deborah Dashow
TITLE Views of Nonprint Media: A Case for Expanded Literacy.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Secondary School English Conference (Boston, Massachusetts, April 2-4, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audiovisual Aids; Broadcast Television; *Educational Radio; *Educational Television; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Media; Literacy; Media Selection; Radio; Television Curriculum; *Visual Literacy

ABSTRACT

The process of becoming literate today means both visual and verbal literacy. There is no need, however, to choose between print and nonprint media as teaching tools. Today's "new media" serve to expand and accentuate the world of printed words and provide valuable means of learning in and of themselves. Visual literacy implies developing an awareness and understanding of documentaries, network news programs, situation comedies, and other media presences which prevade our lives. Teaching toward an expanded literacy demands a change in teacher authority and a shattering of the misconception that the classroom is the realm of cognitive and not affective operations. Effective visual media for use in the classroom include films, radio, and daytime soap operas. A discussion process can tune student responses of plot retention, interpretation, emotion, and evaluation. In this manner, students may become aware, selective participants in the total media culture. (KS)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED123647

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# VIEWS OF NONPRINT MEDIA:

# A CASE FOR EXPANDED LITERACY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Deborah Dashow Ruth

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Deborah Dashow Ruth
Chairperson, Education Extension
University of California, Berkeley 94720

The following letter recently appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle's advice to the lovelorn column:

> DEAR ABBY: This may sound crazy, but I need your advice. I am divorced and the mother of a sweet, 4 year old boy named Ronnie.
>
> We were at home recently when an armed intruder confronted us. The man was gentle and he quickly put Ronnie at ease. He wanted only money and promised not to hurt us. We both explained to Ronnie that Mommy would have to be tied up for a while. He seemed to understand.
>
> After I was bound and gagged, Ronnie was told to turn the TV on and when the program was over (about 20 minutes) he could help me or call for help. I was taken to another room and the robber left.
>
> Abby, my son spent the next THREE HOURS watching TV while I was bound and utterly helpless. I finally managed, through the gag, to tell him to go next door for help.
>
> Could Ronnie possibly have some hostility toward me? Should I see a psychologist? Please answer.
>
> signed TIED UP

---

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Secondary School English Conference (National Council of Teachers of English), Boston, April 2-4, 1976.

CS 202 737

Abby responded:

> DEAR TIED: From your description of the way the intruder put Ronnie at ease and "explained" that you had to be tied up for a while, the boy obviously felt no urgency about getting help or setting you free. Psychologist? Hostility? What for? The kid didn't get the picture -- except on TV. [1]

Ronnie isn't the only kid who's "getting the picture" on T.V.; because this incident is a symptom of something that we teachers can't afford to ignore. My remarks this morning are based on two related premises: Number 1: The most important "basic skill" of all is literacy. And Number 2: Literacy today means more than print literacy. Today we have a new language art - derived from the so-called "new media" - the visual media - and we need to open up English to include these other media. I propose an expanded view of literacy - an "all-media literacy" - to include both visual and verbal media.

Becoming literate has traditionally meant exploring the world of letters to understand or make sense out of one's relation to one's self, to others, and to the social environments that one inhabits or perceives. Traditionally, English courses have taught literacy by having students read about how others organize and communicate their experiences via the written word, and also by having students write about their own experiences or reactions. But students today can also achieve literacy by seeing how others organize and communicate their experiences via the visual image - alone or in combination with written words. Today's "new media" serve to expand the world of printed words, adding visual and nonverbal aspects to experience. All kinds of information are now available to kids at the

twist of a knob, and thus the classroom can no longer be the place for simply the accumulation of information. This old-fashioned conception of function simply puts the classroom in hopeless competition with the more exciting visual sources of information that are so easily accessible to today's students outside of school. Rather, today's classroom should be a place for the interpretation of information, a place for the examination of thoughts and feelings stimulated by the information that students have already accumulated. The classroom should be the place for expression and creation of students' own versions of reality through their use of various media - both print and nonprint.

Let me clarify what I mean when I urge the use of these new media in our classrooms: the best use of the nonprint/visual media flows from what they are uniquely capable of doing, rather than from how well they can "stand in" for the teacher, or merely replace some verbal aspect of the curriculum. Traditionally, nonprint media in English classrooms have served as aids to the teaching of the real, more important subjects, rather than as valuable means of learning in and of themselves. And those "real, more important" subjects have always required that nonprint media be "curriculum-related" to the printed word. (How many of you have had to justify the use of a short film because it was based on a well-known short story? or a film that would serve to "introduce" a unit on, say, the theater in Shakespeare's time?)

I'm not advocating the complete metamorphosis of all English programs into nonprint programs; rather, I'm attempting to make a case for the establishment of an effective combination of print and nonprint media that will help kids become fully literate in our world today, and able to relate effectively with all media, not just books. Let me add here that using the media as education rather than as a-v aids to serve other educational

ends does not mean that these other ends can't also be served simultaneously. My own teaching experience matches that of Richard Maynard who reports in The Celluloid Curriculum that he has seen films stimulate more discussion, inspire more creative writing, motivate more reading, and build up better teacher-student rapport than any education text, device, or gimmick in existence. [2]

In addition to having sound educational value, let's face it: films and tv turn kids on - unlike too many of the traditional school texts and other materials. Tony Schwartz, who has produced thousands of radio and tv spots, especially for political campaigns, and who has been professor of auditory perception at Fordham University, says in his book The Responsive Chord: ". . . because our children learn the language of electronic technology before they enter school, we have no choice but to speak to them in their native tongue." [3]

Now we know a little about what visual or media literacy means. But why do we, as English teachers, need to concern ourselves with this new literacy? Here are several good statistical reasons for being concerned:

First: by the time the average child enters first grade, he/she has watched some 4,000 hours of television. And by the time most American students are 18 years old, they have viewed approximately 15,000 hours of television - that's 5,000 hours more than they have spent in school.

Second: the 6th Annual Gallup Poll on Public Attitudes Toward Education reports these facts about high school juniors and seniors: 30% of those in the upper half of their classes read nothing that was not required: 53% of those in the lower half read nothing not required. And those in the upper half who were reading spent only 17 minutes on a given day reading for pleasure; those in the lower half who were reading spent only 5 minutes a day. [4]

Third: a poll of 1000 junior high school students taken last fall by the Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corporation asked students which medium influenced their lives the most. In descending order: 58% said television; 18 1/2% said books; 12% said radio; 5 1/2% said newspapers; 2 1/2% said magazines; the remaining 3 1/2% didn't answer. [5] (Note that print media accounted for 26 1/2% of the total responses, while nonprint media accounted for 70%.)

Finally, what about the adults? A report by the Roper Organization on Trends in Public Attitudes Toward Television and Other Mass Media from 1959 to 1974 shows the following: of the adults asked which one of the four media they would most want to keep, supposing they could continue to have only one (radio, television, newspapers, or magazines); in 1959, 42% said television, while 32% said newspapers; by 1974, 59% said television, while only 19% said newspapers. [6]

Because we teachers grew up in a largely verbal culture, we learned to have more faith in the printed word and to be wary of the seductive, manipulative visual image. But what about our children who are caught now between a verbal culture that seems to them increasingly dishonest, irrelevant - or simply inaccessible, if they can't read - and a visual culture that seems direct, attractive, and readily accessible to anyone with eyes to see? Where do today's children learn their values? Judging from the statistics I just mentioned, not from books. But most school curricula are heavilty weighted toward helping students understand print media only. Because there's so little in most school curricula to help students make the same kind of sense out of the visual and aural media that surround them, we're in the process of breeding a country of "visual illiterates." The visually illiterate may look but does not really see; may watch but does not really understand; and accepts unquestioningly the authority of both

the medium and the message. There is the danger inherent in our rapidly growing nonprint culture that even if our children do learn to read and write in school, their inability to respond with the same kinds of understanding and judgment to the visual/nonprint media outside of school may effectively neutralize or counteract the growth of whatever sound values they acquire through school reading.

Being visually literate means developing an awareness and understanding of the media environment inhabited by our students - and by us - to help us deal with the following media presences that are part of our everyday lives:

Media Presence #1: documentaries, whether films or television programs, and the idea of so-called "objectivity." Frederick Wiseman, the controversial creator of such documentaries as High School, Hospital, Basic Training, and Welfare, is often criticized - both by his viewers and by the subjects of his films - for not being "objective," when in fact, no film or television program can claim genuine "scientific" objectivity. Wiseman himself calls his films "reality fictions. Reality in that the people are real and the events unstaged; fictions in the sense that I have condensed and ordered those events in a fashion they did not have in real life." [7] The notion of a "real world" caught by the so-called "objective eye" of the camera is made false by the cameraman's careful manipulation of reality; that is, the editing process necessary for a good documentary. Simply pressing the shutter button on a camera is an editorial - subjective - decision. Awareness of this can aid the development of visual literacy.

Media Presence #2: network news programs - the "straight" information we get from tv - or do we? Elmer Lower, president of ABC News says: "The essence of journalism is the editing process." [8] Except in rare instances, what is seen on network news is not the event itself taking place before a

live camera; it is not even a filmed record, but rather a story about the event, reconstructed on film from selected fragments of the filmed event." [9] Jay Epstein, author of News From Nowhere, a fascinating account of the making of network news programs; quotes a leading film editor as saying, "Given at random, say, half a dozen shots of different nature and subject, there are any number of possible combinations of the six that, with the right twist of commentary, could make film sense." [10] Network news programs are no more "objective" than personal documentaries. Awareness of this, too, can aid the development of visual literacy.

Media Presence #3: situation comedies, the "light entertainment" offered to us by the networks during prime time. TV Guide, an excellent resource on television, had a recent article on Archie Bunker, titled "Do the Bigots Miss the Message?" The operating premise of All in the Family is that Archie always loses. No matter what the issue, his reasoning is cockeyed and he's made to look the fool. The program is meant to be a satire on bigots and their biases. But one study found that people who were like Archie tended to agree with him more than people who were not like him. These people were unable to differentiate "source" and "message," and thus, as the researchers report, there's a high probability that Archie becomes for them a credible source, and that his "racist" message is favorably accepted. [11] (In fact, what I call the "authority quotient" of television is so high that even such a character as Archie Bunker is credible simply because he is seen as "important" enough to be on television.)

Another study - one that included high school adolescents - found that many viewers didn't see the program as a satire on bigotry; they had identified with Archie rather than with his son-in-law Mike; they saw Archie as winning, didn't perceive him as the character who was most ridiculed, and saw nothing wrong with his use of racial slurs. The authors of this

study suggest that what's happening here is "selective perception" - meaning, simply, that human beings tend to see and hear what they want to see and hear. [12] "Selective perception," to me, is the result of being "visually illiterate." Awareness and understanding of this, too, can aid the development of visual literacy.

Now, I'd like to spend a few moments correcting some commonly-held misconceptions about teaching the new media, as well as suggesting several changes in our roles as teachers as we incorporate nonprint media into our classrooms.

First misconception is the "either-or" syndrome. Teaching the new languages of nonprint media does not imply the need to make a choice of nonprint over print, of movies or tv over books. The process of becoming fully literate today means both visual and verbal literacy. Too many English teachers today are what I call "print chauvinists;" they believe that a film is merely an audio-visual aid and shouldn't be granted a place in the curriculum equal in status to that of a book. Certainly we can continue to have a personal preference for reading, but we can also learn to accept our students' preference for the visual media, and through our own growing visual literacy, we can begin to feel confident that we're helping our students become better viewers - at the same time that we continue to help them become better readers. We simply have a dual goal. Consider this amazing statement by Tony Schwartz: "A child does not have to read in order to acquire knowledge. This is not to argue that reading is an unimportant skill. However, it is no longer an essential skill that must be acquired before a child can grow intellectually." [13] The predictions of Marshall McLuhan not withstanding, the birth and growth of the "new" media will not cause the death of the "old" media. But we must avoid creating a "phony dichotomy" between word media and image media; there is

no need to make a choice between them. We should also realize that the various media use both words and images to reinforce each other. No film or tv show was ever produced that didn't either start with words or use words - written and spoken - in some way. In fact, most tv shows actually are more reliant on words than images to communicate knowledge. (TV stations report more complaints when a loss of sound occurs than when a loss of picture occurs.) Conversely, literature and radio drama are often praised for their appeal to the visual dimension of imagination. [14]

A second misconception is that the classroom is a place for thinking, not for feeling; for cognitive operations, not affective operations - as if these two could really be separated or fragmented, as education traditionally has seemed to do. Teachers who use nonprint media effectively not only encourage students to express their feelings, but are willing to express and share their own. Teachers who use nonprint media effectively have discovered fresh opportunities to reach and touch their students in a way that can bring back the turned off, tuned out student. In so doing, they raise imagination and feeling to the same level of respect and acceptance in the classroom as that which has traditionally been granted to thoughts and ideas.

Teaching toward expanded literacy also requires some changes in our roles in the classroom. The teacher has always been the authority figure in the world of print media - because the teacher could read, had read a lot, and could teach kids who couldn't read, or who hadn't read a lot. Today, in a world of nonprint media, the teacher is no longer the authority, since kids already have the ability to see, and have already watched a lot of films and tv shows - in fact, more than most teachers. This situation has important implications for the teacher's new role in the classroom: teachers who use nonprint media effectively are willing to share their authority role

with their students - and to learn along with their students. The rewards of such a role change are likely to far outweigh the risks. Richard Maynard describes his experience as this kind of teacher: "I lectured less, the class discussed more, and I discovered that personally I could be a lot more effective by guiding rather than directing. . . . In terms of selecting the films . . . I called the shots . . . but once I turned on that projector, things were different. My students and I were on a new, common ground. We were sharing an experience together. We had begun to communicate." [15]
The excellent handbook titled Doing the Media: A Portfolio of Activities and Resources, published by the Center for Understanding Media, provides a friendly warning along these lines: it says, "Caution: media making and media perceiving make authority an anachronism." [16]

Once we realize that we have different children entering our classrooms - children with more experiences via television and movies than children of 25 or even 10 years ago, we can begin to restructure our teaching and redefine our roles as teachers in new and exciting ways, without compromising our professional standards, and end up doing a better job of teaching toward literacy. Tony Schwartz again: "A child enters the classroom today with the world stored in him. He possesses more information than any school could ever teach him. As a result, the education process has been reversed. Rather than cram new information into an empty shell, the schools' function is to order existing knowledge. That is, to promote recall and feedback of the student's own experiences and involve him in the learning process - so he can best utilize the information stored within him. In this situation, the teacher has a much more complex role. He is no longer a bricklayer, piling up pieces of knowledge in a student. Rather, he helps a student discover how those building materials (the student's experiences outside the classroom) can be structured to serve the student's

needs . . . to organize into a meaningful context the raw knowledge a student has already accumulated from life. The teacher can made the student aware of that which he already knows, and understand its meaning for his social and intellectual growth." [17]

What are some effective media to use in our classrooms? Freely translated, this means, "What can I do on Monday morning?" First, there's film. I love feature films myself, but I find they present too many logistical and time problems for easy, regular use in the classroom. (How do you show a 93 minute film within a 45 minute period?) I urge the use of short films - three to ten minutes in length - that can be re-shown during the same period - or maybe even a 20-25 minute longer short film. As to content, we should avoid limiting our choices of films to films-from-well-known-short-stories, since these kinds of films get considered primarily as "literary" works, and the "film-as-film" elements tend to get lost. Try your own district offices and your public libraries for short, non-narrated, animated films as the best examples of the kind of film I'm talking about.

Second is radio. In a recent issue of Educational Technology, two Utah teachers describe some exciting uses of old-time radio programs that are available on records or cassettes. Karen Hall and Larry Palmatier observe that today's students are not really good listeners; they're unaccustomed to the kind of listening necessary to follow a plot by ear alone. Records of old-time radio programs are not only fun, but effective in rejuvenating this faded sense. Students' minds become more alert, since they must not only listen carefully, but must mentally create characters, settings, and moods, using only the sense of hearing to create these realities in their imaginations. Television leaves no doubt as to Matt Dillon's appearance, but old-time radio conjures up unlimited creations in unlimited minds. Arguments may follow classroom listening sessions - just what are the

contents of Fibber McGee's closet? Each student can write or orally relate his/her own ideas - and all are valid, all have substance. Every student is correct and no one feels put down - it's a success experience. Even if the specific subjects of debate may seem trivial, it's the thinking and imagining processes that are being exercised - and the kids reap much-needed ego rewards from such discussions. [18]

Third: -are you ready for this? - the daytime soaps on TV that run during school hours. The January 12, 1976 issue of Time Magazine has a fascinating and delightful article about tv soap operas. Whatever you may think of them, they've got a lot: plots, subplots, characterization, conflict, suspense, social issues, personal and interpersonal struggles galore, and difficult decisions - as well as different points of view about "life" in the 1970s. (Mary Hartman, Mary Hartman adds the elements of parody and satire to this list.) If you think that "housewives and other shut-ins" are the only ones addicted to the soaps, the Time article gives us some surprises: Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall slips away from deliberations to ponder Days of Our Lives; novelist Dan Wakefield reportedly bursts into tears when he hears the music of All My Children; and at Princeton University, no less, something like a quarter of the total student body drops everything to watch The Young and the Restless every afternoon. A group of students at Duke University was asked why they watched the soaps, and one young man replied: "It's the only constant in our lives." [19] Yes, let's use the soaps in our classrooms: kids can role-play episodes, re-write resolutions of conflicts, write critiques of the acting, and even develop their own soap operas, and perform or broadcast them at school.

Once we've welcomed these visual/nonprint media into our classrooms, how do we begin to develop visual literacy? I want to suggest and describe a simple adaptation of an already existing teaching technique that can be

used with visual media: this technique is called discussion: discussion centered in the realities of a shared media experience; discussion participated in by teachers as well as by students (since teachers are also participants in the shared experience of viewing a film or tv program); discussion that acknowledges feelings as well as thoughts; discussion that helps viewers make order and meaning out of the shared visual experience - the first step toward visual literacy. I want to show a very short film, and then describe this discussion technique: (The film is titled Genius Man, runs two minutes, and is distributed by ACI Films.) [20]

For this kind of discussion, a short, non-narrated animated film is best - one with an easily discernible story line, communicated through familiar visual images, because it's readily accessible to students of all ages and backgrounds. What I'll now describe is a simple four-stage discussion sequence for encouraging and dealing with responses to films. It's loosely structured, flexible, and open-ended, designed to open up both cognitive and affective responses to film. Briefly: stage 1 is "What did you see?" Stage 2 is "What do you think it means?" Stage 3 is "How did it make you feel?" and Stage 4 is "How good do you think it was?" Now in more detail: At stage 1, we ask, What did you see? or What do you remember seeing on the screen? This requires a literal narrative or retelling of what the student saw in straight, objective, non-interpretive, non-judgmental language. This stage emphasizes the role of perception in remembering and reporting accurately. Although we all looked at the same film just now, we all actually saw and created different films in our "mind's eye," because we brought to this viewing event our own individual contexts, different cultural backgrounds, different experiences. This first stage focuses the viewer's attention on the data on the screen, so that the class can agree on what constituted the shared experience of the film. Then we show the film a

second time so everyone can check out the accuracy of their perception and memory. This is the only place in the discussion where a viewer can be said to be "right" or "wrong." We start here for two reasons: first, too many students (and teachers too) want to begin immediately looking for the meaning in a film like this, seeking that one right interpretation before they are even fully aware of what they saw. Second, many students' initial response to films like this is, "That was a stupid film." This is a judgmental response, and should be saved until Stage 4.

At Stage 2, we ask, What do you think it means? or How might you interpret what you saw? Here's where we discuss possible symbolic meanings, messages, morals, etc. Any interpretation is "right" if it can be related to the actual content of the film - as discussed in stage 1. This second stage encourages exploration into the subjective nature of meaning; it discourages the "one right answer" syndrome that's so prevalent in many classrooms in discussions of this sort. No one person - the teacher, another student, or even the filmmaker - can assign a single "correct" meaning to a given work. Each viewer constructs personal meanings that are "correct" for him/her.

At stage 3 we ask, What did you feel during that film? or, What are you feeling now about that viewing experience. This is not intended to be an invasion of the student's privacy, sicne the student must have the option to "pass" on this question. (Film viewing is really a very personal experience.) But this is an invitation to share personal reactions, and to discover that others were affected similarly - or very differently. Discussion at this stage can wander in all directions, since the focus is not on the film itself, but on the different reactions the film caused in different viewers. (Teachers should be prepared to share their own feelings here, too.)

At stage 4, we ask, Did you like it? or, Based on what you thought the

film meant, how well did you think this meaning was communicated? or, Was it worth communicating at all? This is where students exercise critical thinking on questions of value - and give their reasons for their judgments. If discussion should begin at this stage ("That was a stupid film") most viewers would be unable to articulate the reasons for their reactions; but by going through the other stages, they not only get in touch with their thoughts and feelings, but may even change their initial reactions. This is where they become responsible critics, able to challenge anyone who insists on that "one right answer." This stage helps students understand that a film - or story or poem - can be liked or disliked for intellectually valid reasons.

Let me hasten to add that as useful and effective as this four-stage discussion sequence can be, it is, of course, artificial; we don't naturally go though such a structured kind of responding. However, it's not necessary to go through every stage for every film, nor is it necessary to proceed in order, since all of the stages are equivalent in importance. Once this basic sequence is tried, subsequent discussions can begin with stage 3 or 2, or can mix them up together, as desired. However, if discussions get bogged down by disagreements over "what really happened," the film can be reshown and discussion can pick up at stage 1 for the clarification that's essential for more productive further discussion or other activities. As an exercise in learning - or re-learning - how to see, I have found this to be an important step in the development of visual literacy.

My concluding remarks are entitled simply "Making it all better." Although I really believe that "movies are better than ever," you still have to sift through a lot of junk to find the good stuff - in both short and feature films. And, of course, television programming has in general been a disappointment; the medium offers more potential for excellence than

the messages that have been broadcast. How can it all be made better? Rather, how can what we do as English teachers help improve these "new" media?

Instead of lamenting the sorry state of most tv programming that attracts such a large amount of our students' time and attention, we should realize that our students today are possibly tomorrow's tv and film producers, directors, and - yes - writers; and we should open up our print-based and print-biased curriculum to the visual media so that the quality of future media offerings might have a chance to improve. Marvin Kitman, TV critic for Newsday, makes this observation about the future improvement of television: "Television is a medium that's in its infancy. You have to go back and look at other new media when they were invented. Take print. After Gutenburg invented movable type, it took almost 80 years until someone thought of numbering the pages in a book. It took 225 years for anyone to think of using print to write a novel. Give television 200 years and you'll really see a creative medium. They'll figure out how to number the pages." [21] But maybe we won't have to wait 200 years if we realize and take advantage of the fact that better audiences mean better programs. Kit Laybourne of the Center for Understanding Media suggests that as we help students make sense out of television and as they develop their own values and expectations, it is possible that we will be helping the television medium improve itself. In fact, the Center has found that student use of videotape led to more discriminating viewing of television. [22] Indeed, the effects of media literacy today on media quality tomorrow can only be beneficial. Ed Diamond, TV critic and lecturer at MIT, predicts that future audiences will be demanding better fare, more information, more news, because audiences are getting better - they're more skeptical, more sophisticated, more selective. [23]

And where do these "better audiences" come from? From our classrooms today. We cannot - we must not - close our eyes, either literally or figuratively, to the role the new visual media already play and will continue to play in the lives of our students - and in their future lives as adults.

A most telling example of the need for expanded literacy is the following letter to Terrence O'Flaherty, TV critic for the San Francisco Chronicle: "My youngest daughter is a bright, brown-eyed 4-year old who is no better or no worse than the average youngster her age. She watches television in a desultory manner, and I didn't think she was over-exposed to it --- not until last night, that is. We were sitting around in a cozy family group watching some show whose title I have forgotten, when this little moppet turned her winsome, dimpled face up to me and lisped, 'When I grow up, can I kill people?' I was really alarmed, and carried on at some length, after which she gathered that killing people was not right, and that mother didn't approve. Then she asked, 'Okay, then can I ride a horse?' There must be a moral here someplace . . . . " [24]

I think there is a moral here someplace. There are many youngsters out there who can't tell the difference between growing up and killing people and growing up and riding a horse. I believe that there's a clear and present need for education to begin helping all students become aware, wise, humane, and selective participants in the total media culture - in other words, to achieve expanded literacy.

Footnotes

1. Abigail Van Buren, San Francisco Chronicle, 9 June, 1975.

2. Richard A. Maynard, The Celluloid Curriculum: How to Use Movies in the Classroom (New York: Hayden Book Co., 1971), p. 3.

3. Tony Schwartz, The Responsive Chord (New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1973), p. 135.

4. George H. Gallup, "Sixth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LVI, no. 1, Sept. 1974, p. 27 and p. 32.

5. San Francisco Chronicle, 5 Jan., 1976, p. 2.

6. Burns W. Roper/The Roper Organization, Inc., Trends in Public Attitudes Toward Television and Other Mass Media, 1959-1974 (New York: Television Information Office, 1975), pp. 4-5.

7. San Francisco Sunday Examiner and Chronicle: Datebook, 14 March, 1976, p. 27.

8. Edward Jay Epstein, News From Nowhere: Television and the News (New York: Randon House, 1973), p. 152.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid., p. 174.

11. Leonard Gross, "Do the Bigots Miss the Message?" TV Guide, Nov. 8-14, 1975, pp. 14-18.

12. Ibid.

13. Schwartz, op. cit. p. 118.

14. James Morrow and Murray Suid, "Media in the Classroom: Some Pedagogical Issues," English Journal, Vol. 63, No. 7, Oct. 1974, p. 38.

15. Maynard, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

16. Robert Geller and Kit Laybourne, "Some Guidelines for Film/Media Programs," in Doing the Media: A Portfolio of Activities and Resources (New York: The Center for Understanding Media, 1972), p. 36.

17. Schwartz, op. cit., pp. 113-114.

18. Karen Hall and Larry L. Palmatier, "Radio in the Classroom: Fibber McGee and Who?" Educational Technology, Jan. 1976, Vol. XVI, no. 1, p. 57.

19. Time Magazine, 12 Jan. 1976, p. 46.

20. "Genius Man," distributed by ACI Films, Inc., 35 West 45th Street, New York, New York 10036.

21. KQED Focus, Jan. 1976, Vol. 22, no. 1, p. 18.

22. Kit Laybourne,"Television Study," in Doing the Media, op. cit., pp. 170-171.

23. KQED Focus, op. cit., p. 19.

24. San Francisco Chronicle, 18 Feb., 1976, p. 38.